

51
PEACE and UNION:

OR, A

DEFENCE

OF

Sir *Humphry Mackworth's* Treatise

ON

The Occasional BILL,

In Answer to a TREATISE Entitled

PEACE without UNION;

And to all the other

Numerous Pamphlets

Wrote against it by

Occasional Conformists.

L O N D O N:

Printed for John Nutt, near Stationers-Hall, 1764.

74
73

PEACE and UNION

OR

DEFENCE

OF

Sir Humphrey Mackintosh's Treatise

ON

The Occasional B. & F.

IN ANSWER TO A RESOLUTION

PEACE and UNION



Summaries of pamphlets

and it being

Occasional Contributions

S
of
ch
ap

m
ba
B
D
A
lit
M
on
lic
Tr
an

car
tho
eve
con
Bu
and
wh
pre
of

To Sir Humphry Mackworth.

S I R,

I Have with great impatience expected an Answer to the Numerous Pamphlets wrote against your late Treatise on the Occasional Bill, and tho' I observed no Reasons or Arguments in any of them, that could be of weight with Men of Sound and Unbias'd Judgments, yet I thought the Fallacy and Insincerity of some of them deserv'd to be expos'd and laid open for the Common Good of Mankind, especially of those, who have not Time or Opportunity to examine their Allegations, but are apt to take every thing for Truth that is not Contradicted.

I must confess I was at first inclined to believe, that something of this nature might have proceeded from your own Pen, and with your Name to it, which would have given much greater Satisfaction to the World; but when your Abstract of the Bill for the Relief of the Poor came to my Hands, and I consider'd not only your Declaration against replying to any Unknown Writers, and the Necessity of your daily Attendance on the more weighty Affairs of the Nation in Parliament, but also how little it would become a Person of your Character, to engage in a Paper War, with such Men as De Foe and the Observator, whose Excellencies consist in Satyr and Reflections, I gave over that Expectation, and resolved to expose these hasty Thoughts to publick Consideration, not doubting but the Sincerity of my Intentions to vindicate the Truth, and to promote the Publick Good, will appologize with the best part of Mankind, and particularly with your self, for the Weakness of the Performance.

I must acknowledge the Language of some of your Antagonists, has made me more careless and negligent in many Expressions, which yet can never equal the Malice of those, who have Treated you in the most inhuman and barbarous manner, and are every Day inventing the most notorious Falsities, to blacken your Character, and discourage all good Men in the Discharge of their Duty for the Good of their Country: But altho' I am sensible that nothing can be more ungrateful to a Man of your Temper and Principles, than to imagine you can be pleased with publick Commendations, which I have therefore industriously avoided; yet I hope you will not be offended that I presume in this one Particular, to encourage you to persevere in the Faithful Discharge of the Trust reposed in you, by acquainting you, That even the Malice of your Enemies

B

has

has (amongst all Good Men) turned to your Honour, and advanc'd your Reputation.

And I doubt not but in due time the Conscientious Dissenters will be also convinced, that you have acted the part of a good Christian, and a good States-man, and have not proposed any thing to publick Consideration, but what you had very good Reason to believe, did very much tend to their Advantage, as well as to the general good of the whole Nation; and as the greatest Calm doth generally follow the most violent Storm, so I hope, after all the Noise and Clamour that has been rais'd without cause upon this Occasion, by Violent, Unreasonable, and Self-designing Men, yet we shall at last be able (thro' the Assistance of Divine Providence) to arrive at some happy Port or other, which may afford us the great Blessing of that Peace and Union, so graciously recommended by Her Majesty to all Her Subjects.

This, Sir, is the sole end of Writing this Treatise, and of defending yours, and that the Dissenters may take notice of the Fallacy of their pretended Friends, and of the plain Dealing and good Intentions of those that have given them that Ease and Indulgence they now enjoy, and are willing to establish the same upon a sure and lasting Foundation to all Posterity; and that, instead of Fears and Jealousies, there may be that Mutual Security and Good Understanding amongst all Her Majesties Subjects, which you have propos'd, is very heartily desir'd by,

Sir,

Your very Humble Servant

J. S.

PEACE and UNION:

OR, A

DEFENCE

OF

Sir *Humphry Mackworth's* Treatise

ON THE

Occasional Bill, &c.

THE Reason of all Wise Men, must needs be the Reason of all Wise Nations; and no Wise Man, laying Prejudice and Interest aside, can think it Reasonable or Safe, that those Persons should be Entrusted with the Preservation of the National Church, and the Execution of any Laws, whose Interest it is to Defeat and Destroy them; tho' it is not now a time (it seems) to do those things that are Reasonable and Safe. The *Acts of Uniformity*, the *Corporation* and *Test-Acts*, and all the Laws formerly made for the Security of the Establish'd Government in Church and State, are such as no Man can imagine the *Dissenters* would ever have Establish'd, or would not readily Repeal if they had an opportunity to do it. I am perswaded that many of them are Men of that Candour, that they will not deny it; and therefore as Sir H. M. observes, will any Wise Man chuse a Person (how honest soever in other Matters) to be Guardian of his Son, who will gain an Estate by his Death and Destruction? Or will any Wise Nation agree that those Persons are proper to be made Magistrates, and have the Guardianship of the Laws, that desire nothing more than the Repeal of them? These are Propositions so very absurd, that no Man hath hitherto had the Confidence directly to maintain; therefore what does it signify that some Nations are forc'd to act otherwise in particular Cases, if the thing in it self be reasonable and fit to be done? They must all agree in the reason of the Case, tho' they are not able in many Countries to attain to the practise of it; of which Sir H. M. was so sensible, that he expressly excepts *the practise in ancient Times, in particular Cases, and on extraordinary Occasions*. He could not be ignorant, that in some Nations the *Dissenters* are establish'd by Capitulations and Acts of State, as in *Hungary*, *Bobemia*, part of *Germany*, and other Countries; and particularly by the *Treaties of Westphalia* and *Munster*. Many of which were Acts of Necessity, and not of Choice: The Emperor did not act in these Cases as he did desire to do, but as the Circumstances of Affairs did then require.

quire. In like manner the Kings of *France* have sometimes been forced, as the Duke of *Savoy* is at present, to make use of his Dissenting Subjects, and grant them Power and Authority; which was not done because they thought it most politick and prudent in general, but because they were under a Necessity at that time, and in those particular Cases so to do. And thus Sir *H.* does Allow. That in *ancient Times, in particular Cases, and on extraordinary Occasions*, the Dissenters were admitted into Power and Dominion with the National Church; and I dare say he heartily wishes they were establish'd in all Popish Countries, because he must believe that they are in the right, and the National Church in the wrong, and where the Differences are in Essentials, the Separation is Lawful. But yet he may very well believe that all Wise Nations are of the same Opinion, that it is necessary, as far as it is practicable and consistent with former Capitulations and Concessions of the State, to preserve the Administration of Publick Affairs in the hands of Persons of one and the same Perswasion in Matters of Religion, that there may be Unity and Uniformity in the Church and State, and whilst all the Publick Officers are aiming at one and the same Common End, the Publick Good, neither they nor the Nation may be deprived of that End, by any unnecessary Dissentions or Clashings amongst themselves about the Means to attain it; and that it is more especially necessary in these Kingdoms and Countries, where the Establish'd Government in Church and State, hath been formerly overturn'd and destroy'd by the Dissenters from it. Where there is no Danger, there needs no Law; and where the Dissenters are few, and always liv'd peaceable, there is no reason for Fears and Jealousies; but where Persecutions and Sequestrations have been practis'd in the Memory of many Men now living, and great Persons are setting up for extraordinary Powers by their assistance, a prudent Caution is not to be condemn'd, but must be the sense of all, and the practise of as many Wise Nations as could with safety attain to it.

It is agreed to be the practise at this day in *Portugal, Spain, Italy* and *France*, which are large Dominions, and a great part of *Europe*; and tho' the Errors and Inquisition of those Countries are to be abhorred, yet their Humane Policy and Maxims of State, as far as they are consistent with true Religion and Charity, are not to be despis'd; for by that means they have so long preserv'd an Erroneous Church; and I don't know why good Men may not be allowed to use as much Policy to preserve the Church of *England* and a Regulated Monarchy, as they do to preserve Popery and Arbitrary Power. I am for avoiding all that is ill in those Countries, and yet not be asham'd to espouse what is prudent and safe.

I will not trouble the Reader with the sense nor practise of some other great Empires in the World, as *Muscovy, Turkey, Persia, China, &c.* who all observe this Rule, with Sir *H.*'s exception of *particular Cases, and on extraordinary Occasions*; but I'll come home to a Nation that all Parties will allow to be a Wise and Prudent People, and that is the *States of Holland*; why will they not refer the Case in Controversie to their Determination? They are our Friends and Allies, they will not offer any thing that is hard to any Party whatsoever amongst us; and yet the High and Mighty States, Men of great Candour to Dissenters, whether Popish or Protestant, have a National Church, and do keep all Dissenters from it, out of the Administration of Publick Affairs relating to the Civil Government, and nothing but Necessity, for want of Men, to serve in their Fleets and Armies, forces them to admit a greater Liberty in Military and Naval Employments.

There are many other Kingdoms and Countries that do the same thing, tho' not in the same manner and by the same sort of Laws. *Denmark* and *Swedeland*, and most of the Protestant Princes in *Germany* have a National Church, and unless in Particula

Particular Cases, and on extraordinary Occasions, they employ no other in the Administration. In *Scotland* they are so far from giving them equal share in the Administration, that they wou'd not allow a Toleration, which they tell you, would be to establish *Iniquity by a Law*: Nay, they have made it High Treason to Write or Speak for the *Prelatical Government*. Here is Moderation with a Witness! And such a Moderation as was once before practis'd in *England*: For did the State-Dissenters when Established by Usurpation in this Nation, allow a share of the Administration to the Members of the Church, or did they so much as leave them to enjoy their Liberties and Properties? What Seizures, what Sequestrations, what Prosecutions were carried on in those Days, when the Moderate Men had got the Power in their own hands; and now he that stands up for the Mutual Security both of Church-men and Dissenters, is no less than a *Jacobite*, a *High-Flyer*, and no-body knows what? These are Men of Blessed Principles to govern a Nation.

It would be too tedious for this Discourse to run over the Histories of every particular Country; there is no need of it; for whoever will look into them, will find that all wise Nations in the World, even those who have been cited on the other side, do all agree in having a National Church, and of keeping the Administration in the hands of those who are Members of it; unless it be in *particular Cases and on extraordinary Occasions*, which is all that Sir H. M. did assert. The Example of *Ch. the 5th.* quoted on the other side, is express in the Point, for he was zealous to preserve *Unity and Uniformity in the Church and State*, tho' in a wrong Cause: He Fought for it as long as he thought it safe, but his Subjects, (who dissented for Conscience only, not for Trifles and Ceremonies, not in Opposition to the Authority of their Prince in indifferent Matters, but in Opposition to Essential Errors crept into the Church, and even to Idolatry it self,) having had better Success than was expected, the Emperor was necessitated at last to grant them a Share of the Magistracy in those Countries, of *Hungary, Bohemia, and Transylvania*; from all which it is plain, that the Emperor did agree in the Reason of the Case, tho' he was not able to attain to the Practice of it. The like Observation may be made upon other Cases mentioned in the several Answers to Sir H's Treatise.

As to the Instance of *Poland and Saxony*, it is much the same as *England and Scotland*, where two National Churches are establish'd that differ from one another, and as the King of *Poland* is the Head of both, he is necessitated in his Arms to make use of both in his own Defence, which yet does not extend to the Civil Government, and is also a very particular Case; and yet there seems to be a great Difference between employing Subjects of another Kingdom, who are Members of a National Church, and Subjects in the same Kingdom who dissent from it: The later may be concern'd in Interest to overturn the Constitution, and the others may not; for when the War is ended they return to their own Country, where they enjoy their Religion in Peace and Unity.

As to the free Cities in *Germany*, &c. those are Occasional Settlements of lesser Consideration, where Necessity supplies the place of a Law, and where yet there are established Churches, and a sort of Uniformity in them; and where two Forms of Worship are established in the Original Institution, neither can be said to be Dissenters from the Establishment.

As to the Revolt of the Seven Provinces, if they had obtained an *Act of Toleration*, instead of the *Inquisition*, it may be presum'd, all Matters would have been settled in Peace and Unity, and they would never have rebell'd for an Office, or con-

tended with the Government to be the Established Church; and as to what happened upon the Revolution in the Reign of King H. the 8th. it is nothing at all to this purpose, and all new Revolutions are particular Cases.

The Primitive Christians indeed (amongst whom there were no Dissenters) had given such Proofs of their Sincerity and Submission even to the Heathen and most wicked Emperors, that they came at last to be entrusted in their Armies; but they did not preach up the Doctrine of deposing Princes, but of paying Obedience to them; and when the State-Dissenters will solemnly renounce that Doctrine, and give Assurance to maintain the present Establishment in the Church and State, they may not only have the Benefit of shewing their Courage in the Armies abroad, but their Wisdom also in the Councils at Home.

But what are all these Cases to the Matter in Debate? Sir H. lays down a General Rule, That *all Wise Nations agree in such Propositions, except it be in particular Cases and on extraordinary Occasions.* Those Gentlemen don't answer the Reason of the Case, but set forth the contrary Practice in several particular Cases, which no Body did deny. Nay the L——ds themselves have all assented to the Reason of the thing, tho' they did not think it proper at this time to put it in practice, which may also be taken notice of as a very particular Case.

But now behold the *Truth*, the *Sincerity*, and the *fair Dealing* which a Church-man is like to meet with from *Occasional Conformists*, and especially from the *Author of the shortest Way with a Dissenter*, who in their several Pamphlets, take care to omit those particular Expressions, which contain a full Answer in themselves to all their Objections. *They first answer a whole Treatise by Objections to two Sentences, and they first alter the Sentences, before they make any Objections.*

In the End of a Paragraph sometimes an Omission is made (for brevity's sake) of Words that are not very Material in the present Debate, but to leave out Material Words in the middle of a Sentence, is a thing never done by an honest and fair Writer, but may pass for a Virtue in those Persons that claim a Liberty to conform to any thing that is for their Advantage; when it is for their Interest to tell the Truth, they can, tho' unwillingly, conform to that: But when they find it advantagious to assert a Falsity, they triumph in their Wickedness as a certain Person did in the Play-House over the Bill of Conformity, with Publick Rejoicings and Clapping of Hands, Singing aloud, *Victoria, Victoria.* This is that Eminent Man that is so Famous for his great Piety, Moderation, and Virtue; and who is now become the great Patron of all those that call themselves the Religious and Sober Party of the Nation.

But to handle *Daniel de Foe* in his own way; as he excuses his Defect of Argument and Reason, by telling a Story about Duelling; so I will beg leave to reply to his sincere and consistent Discourse, with a Story between a *Presbyterian* and a *Quaker*, who having a Controversy about Matters in Religion, and the *Presbyterian* observing that the *Quaker* supported his Arguments by several remote incoherent Texts of Scripture put together, tho' no ways relating to one another. He told him, That he would undertake in his way of arguing to prove out of Scripture, that the *Quaker* ought to go and hang himself, with which he was very much offended; but however he offer'd to prove it thus; it is written (says the *Presbyterian*) in Scripture, such a Chapter, and such a Verse, *Judas hang'd himself*; and in such a Place it is said, *Do thou so also*, therefore says he, thou mayst go and hang thy self if thou wilt. However, I would not have this Author punish'd so severely as one of his Brethren proposes, but really I can hardly excuse him

him from coming once more to the Pillory, for Indeavouring to steal away a Gentleman's Reputation by false Quotations.

But to be more serious and come to the Point, Every Nation has a particular Government, and depends on particular Circumstances, and that Law that may be unnecessary in one Nation, may be absolutely necessary in another; and therefore when a fair Answer is proposed to any Argument, it ought to extend to the whole, and not to one Paragraph, much less to one Moiety of it, and even that so alter'd and chang'd, as no ways agrees with the Intent of the Writer; But these Gentlemen are only attacking the Out-Works, and they think to undermine the Citadel with Scandalous Reflections.

By this fallacious Method of proceeding, you may guess at the usage Sir H. is to expect through the rest of the Discourse; and now they come to Sir H's second Assertion, *viz. Wherever a National Church hath been establish'd by Acts of Uniformity, as in this Kingdom, the Wise Legislators have generally establish'd some Test, &c. omitting the following words, or other Security, as not thinking it reasonable or safe that any Persons should be Entrusted with the Execution of the Laws, who do not heartily Approve of, or willingly pay Obedience to them.* Here is a second Part of the same Tune; how do these poor Creatures insult over their own Ignorance? For in regard the National Churches abroad are not establish'd just in the same manner as in England, by *Acts of Uniformity* made by *Queen, Lords and Commons*, therefore they argue, That they are not establish'd at all: But certainly wherever there is a National Church, as there is in most Christian Countries, that Church must be established by *some Act of State or other*, and that *Act of State* is an *Act of Uniformity*. Thus again they positively affirm, That in any Country where a Religion is Tolerated, there is not any *Test* to exclude them from Employments, but Sir H. does not insist that they have the same sort of *Test*, but that they have *some Test or other Security*, and that is evident in *Holland*, where even the Papists as well as Dissenters are Tolerated, and yet no Man that ever Travell'd into that Country will deny, but that they are effectually excluded from all Civil Employments and Offices of Trust: And it is not at all Material in the present Argument, by what sort of Security, they are excluded in any Country, so that they are effectually excluded some way or other. Neither does it follow from Sir H's Argument, that he has so very ill an Opinion of the Body of Dissenters in general, as some of those Writers would maliciously suggest, since Sir H. does not argue from the present Vices or Rebellious Principles of the Dissenters that they ought to be excluded, but from the Reasonableness and Nature of the thing; Sir H. does all along through his whole Discourse, discover a great Respect and Tenderneſs for Dissenters: But in regard the Church-men and Dissenters differ in Principles, and cannot agree together in the same means to promote the Publick Good, but the Church-men will be drawing one way and the Dissenters the other, and thereby both they and the Nation be deprived of that *Peace and Union* recommended by Her Majesty; therefore he argues, That it is not consistent with the Peace and Safety of the Nation, that Dissenters be admitted into Publick Offices and Places of Trust; not but that many of them may be good Men in their Way, but that Way is a different Way from the Church; and unless the Publick Officers go together the same way, the Publick Affairs will never be well managed for the Interest of the Nation.

But let Sir H. be as moderate as he pleases, these Writers will never be so, they are in a mighty Fury and Rage for an Office, and are resolv'd only to propose Moderation, but to shew none at all, especially to that Gentleman. They put a wrong Construction upon every Sentence in his Book, and fancy they shall
give

give him a Fatal Blow, by taking notice of that Instance (mentioned in his Dedication) of *H. the 3d. of France*; from whence they conclude that this Worthy Gentleman must be for Popery and Slavery, and I don't know what. But now observe the Sentence, as it is in three Editions of his Book, tho' some part thereof was omitted in one of them.

' Your Dutiful Commons have not so much as attempted any thing for the Security of the Establish'd Government, in Church and State, but by such gentle Methods as are consistent with the *Act of Toleration*, are agreeable to the plain Intent and Meaning of the Laws already in Being, and have been found Successful by frequent Experience; as particularly in that very Case of *Henry the Third of France*, quoted by the said Author; *who Excluding the Hugonots from Publick Offices and Employments, Converted so many in three or four Years, that it was then thought* (if we may believe that Authority) *that if he had continued the same Methods, he might in a short time have reduc'd his whole Kingdom to one Religion*; which, altho' to be abhorred, and not credible in that Nation, where the Differences between Protestants and Papists are in Essentials, and where Truth was to yield to Error, may yet be more practicable in this, where we Protestants differ only in Ceremonies and lesser Matters. And what a Blessing would such a happy Union be, to Your Majesty and this Nation? This is the Sentence, and what is there in all this that sounds so very Ill? Dr. *Davenant* Page 237. had quoted that Instance against the Bill, and therefore Sir *H.* turn'd it upon him in his Dedication, by shewing the Policy of that Prince to be directly against the Doctor's Argument; and those that know this Gentleman's Life and Conversation, his Circumstances in the World, his Concern for his Family, or his Principles in point of Religion, which it is plain by an Expression in p. 2. concerning *Passive Obedience*, this Author had read in a Book, Entitled, *The Principles of a Member of the Black List*, could never believe that of all Men in the World, this Gentleman would ever give way to a Popish Religion, or a French Tyranny.

But does Sir *H.* propose the Example of this King at large to Her Majesty? Not at all; he only proposes the keeping Dissenters out of Office, which all Conscientious Dissenters are already by the Laws in Being, and he would have those Laws extended to the State-Dissenters; he would not have more Favour shew'd to one than to the other. And what does all this signify to the Evil Actions of *H. 3.* What a barbarous Misconstruction is made of this Paragraph? No wonder the Objector is ashamed to set his Name to his Treatise; For he ought to be ashamed to look any honest Man in the Face. *H. 3.* first took violent and then gentle Methods; by the violent he miscarried, by the gentle he had better Success, therefore Sir *H.* recommends the gentle Methods, and this is misconstrued and turned to a contrary Meaning.

But to shew the great Piety and Charity of these sort of Men, one of the Pamphlets suppos'd to be wrote by the Direction of a Sanctify'd Gentleman in the City, makes a very strong Argument against his Book, by shewing that this Gentleman, in his younger days, was mistaken in a point of Law before he had been three years Resident at the Temple; and in a point of Law that all the Judges of England had solemnly determin'd the same way, all the Kings of England had practis'd to that Day, all honest Merchants of England had earnestly petition'd for at that very time, and for which all the Subjects of England had reason to be very thankful; and which at last was thought so very reasonable, that those that opposed that Opinion, for want of an express and positive Statute, yet thought fit to make one for that very purpose; that is to say, to Enable the Successor, to collect the
ancient

ancient Duty of Tunnage and Poundage, during the Interval between the Death of the King and the calling of a Parliament; for otherwise, by an excessive Importation Custom free during that Interval, not only *Thousands of fair Merchants that had paid the Duty would have been Undersold and Ruined, but the Duty it self have been rendred unprofitable for many Years; and the Parliament have been necessitated to have laid a heavy Burthen on the People in lieu of it.* It is true indeed, that one Instance may be given, where the Parliament was call'd and dissolv'd and yet that Duty collected, which certainly could not be justify'd; but in the Case of the *Middle Temple* Address, it was mention'd as a thing in *Aid*, and not in *Opposition* to the Parliament, and for the *Benefit*, not *Disadvantage* of the People. Neither does it follow, that because the Successor might collect this Duty, during the said Interval, therefore he might impose a new Duty on the Subject; for tho' there was not an expresse Statute in this Case, yet there was constant Usage time out of Memory of Man to the contrary, and is not that a Law? Is not the common Law of *England* as binding as any Statute, and is not constant Usage, or Custom Immemorial, especially in any reasonable Case, and *pro bono publico*, part of the Common Law? Certainly it is, and no evil President could have been establish'd by the Example of this Allowance; or else how came all the Parliaments in every Reign but one, to renew this Tax to the Successor, without complaining of the Illegality of the Collection during the Interval?

But after all, How does it appear that Sir *H.* in particular was mistaken in this case? What! Because he presented that Address from a Hundred or more Gentlemen of the *Middle Temple* to the King. Then it is evident, that Sir *H.* must have been in the Chair of that Assembly, and is it usual for any Speaker or Chairman to argue and debate? Or did the Speaker of the House of Commons never carry an Address to the King or Queen, with some Expressions in it contrary to his Sentiments? It was an Honour to Sir *H.* to carry any Address from that Learned Society; and it could not become him at that Age, or in that Station, to have opposed his Superiours, and Men of much longer standing than himself; but to gratify the Malice of this Author, I'll beg leave to suppose for once, that Sir *H.* might be of the same Opinion, and also that he was mistaken in his Judgment; which yet is not admitted but suppos'd, What then? Are not the best Lawyers in *England* mistaken every Day? Is this a Crime? Shall Men be persecuted for Judgment only? Was there ever such a wretched piece of Malice discover'd before? What is all this to the Matter in Controversy? Sir *H. M.* (it seems) is not infallible, ergo the Occasional Conformists ought to have an equal Share in the Administration of Publick Affairs. This is Sir *Solomon's* Occasional Logick; and these are the Men that so much cry out against that very thing, that they themselves do publickly practice.

And is this all you are able to lay to his Charge in so many Years? Has Sir *H.* lived so well, or at least with so much Conduct, that you can charge him with no other Crime but this? Truly Sir, I think it very much for his Honour; I should be glad his Accusers could come off so well; and yet I am perswaded, that if the Occasional Promoter of this Reflection had put his Name to the Book, Sir *H.* would have scorn'd to have made use of any Reflections to encounter his Arguments. What if this Observator were expell'd the House of Commons? What's that to the Merits of this Case? What if he were the chief Cause of setting up one Company, and thereby of the Ruine of another, and of many innocent Families in it? What's all this to the present Debate? Nay, tho' a Man had contriv'd a way to load the Nation with a great Debt only to get an Office for himself, yet still this is no ways material in the present Controversy, and therefore, I verily believe if Sir *H.* had the History of his whole Life before him, as he may,

if he pleases, be presented with it; yet he would rather conceal it, than make use of such mean and scandalous Methods to support his Arguments; and I dare undertake to say one thing more, that whenever Sir H. M. shall commit an Error, of any kind whatsoever, he will be ready to do that, which these sort of Men will neither do themselves, nor suffer any other to do, and that is, *Repent and Amend.*

As to the Invasion of your Birth-Rights; all manner of Laws that impose a Qualification for Publick Officers, would do the same thing. One Law says no Man shall have an Office, but he that will swear to bear Faith and true Allegiance to his Sovereign; this is one such Invasion of your Birth-Rights. Another Law says, That none shall hold a publick Office that will not take the Association, there is another Invasion. A Third Law imposes the Abjuration Oath, and what are all these? O these are no Invasions of any Man's Birth-Right, because we consented to them, in hopes that you would have refused them, and we should have got into your Places: But if you say, No Man shall have an Office, but he that is a constant Conformist to the Church, that is a great Invasion of our Birth-Rights, because we must either lose our Places, or an Opportunity to cheat the honest Dissenter; But what real difference is there between the Cases? They are all but Qualifications for publick Officers; and since you have imposed a great many Tests for fear of us, pray let us impose one, for fear of you. And as to the Infamy you speak of, Do the Conscientious Dissenters who cannot conform, complain of this Matter? They are under the same Restraint already, they are depriv'd of their Birth-Rights (as you call it) by the Laws now in being, and do they make such a Noise about it, or such a harsh Interpretation? No, they are contented with the Laws, and are willing to live quietly with their Neighbours, but you will not; you are afraid of Informers, for what? If you are Dissenters, they can do you no hurt, if you are Church-men, every one of us are in the same Danger; And you may be sure, as soon as any Inconvenience happens, we shall be willing to provide for our own and the Common Safety. But you are mightily offended, when it is said that the Dissenters are not entituled to Offices by the Act of Toleration: And you are pleased to draw your own Conclusion; but I fancy Sir H. meant it thus; All Dissenters are or ought to be excluded by the Laws already in being, from holding publick Offices and Places; the subsequent Act of Toleration does not entitle them to any such Offices, therefore they ought still to be excluded. Now answer this if you can; but you are so very angry, that I fancy you are one that has an Office from the Church, and a good Pension from the Dissenters; and you must lose one or other by this Bill; however, we are not angry with you for taking the Tests and Oaths as you suggest, but for not keeping to them. They were imposed as a sure Mark to know a Church-man from a Dissenter, but you have broke down our Boundaries and Fences by your Occasional Compliance, and you will not give us leave to repair them. You have trespass'd upon us so long, that now you plead a Prescription; and I am afraid you have got such a Jury, that you will go a great way towards recovering from us the whole Lordship. If Misrepresentations, False-Witnesses, Swearing or Lying will do the Business, God help the poor Church-men; they have nothing to trust to, but the Goodness of Providence, a Gracious Queen, and a good Cause; but let not this extend any farther than it is intended, which is only to the harmless Party of Ambidexter Conformists, and not to all of them neither, but to your dear self and your Companions at the Club, take it and welcome.

As to the Deists Sir H. gives a kind Caution, by asking a Question, Whether the Dissenters are sure there are no such Men behind the Curtain? And you accuse

cuse him with a positive Charge, that the Dissenters do join with them; and to indeed you pervert his Meaning throughout the whole Treatise.

As to the Test Act, no doubt it was chiefly intended against the Papists, but every one that runs may see that the whole Body of the Act concerned the Dissenters. And what! Do you think it was a Mistake in the King, Lords, and Commons? Did they not intend it should extend to Dissenters? That is, they passed a Law, and did not intend it should be construed according to the plain meaning. And pray Sir, What say you to the Corporation Act? What! Was that only against Papists? Was not a Sacramental Test appointed by that Law? Was not that chiefly intended against those that had so lately subverted the Constitution, and forced one King to the Scaffold, and the other to save his Life in an Oak? As to the Instance of a High Sheriff, you know that the Laws in being, and not that Bill, introduced that Hardship; and the C——ns were never averse to give ease to the Dissenters in that particular and in a proper way; tho' they have never yet had cause to complain, and being in the hands of the Government, whilst they live peaceable and quiet, have no reason to fear any unkind Usage. Your Description of the Bill, the Limitation and Consequences is all wrong; and in the last Bill, there was no Penalty of 5 *l.* a Day, nor more than 50 *l.* for the whole Offence.

But pray Sir, What occasion is there for the Dissenters in general to be concerned in this Debate? Why must they run any Hazard of Contention or losing their Happiness for the sake of those, that may be as unconstant and unkind to them as to the Church. Why should they that cannot Conform, labour so much for the sake of those that can? If they can Conform to get an Office, they may Conform to keep it, what is that to the Body of *Dissenters*? If they have *Liberty of Conscience*, Freedom of Trade and Commerce, no Prosecutions and Restraints upon their Persons, they cannot doubt but to live happily, and provide for their Families by their Estates and Industry. It cannot be imagin'd that there are very many Publick Officers concern'd in this Bill, and what are they to the whole Body of *Dissenters*? And perhaps there are not *three* in all that number that would not rather part with a Conventicle than part with their Office, and are such Men worth the keeping? Are they of such consequence to the Dissenters, that the Nation must be Divided, and put in Confusion, rather than they should be Disobliged?

But then you'll object, Why are the Churchmen so desirous of this Bill, if so few Converts will be made by it? The reason is plain, Because they would have all Men sincere, and not appear with two Faces, and thereby deceive both *Churchmen* and *Dissenters*. Is it not a general Advantage to know Mens true Principles? If they are really *Dissenters*, they will leave their Offices and stick to their Brethren; if they are *Churchmen* in Perswasion, and only go to a Conventicle to promote their Trade, or other private Interest, they will leave the Conventicle and stick to their Offices, and by this means neither Party can be deceived or deluded by them.

But Sir *H.* also tells you, that Interest is a prevailing thing, and will be apt to encline Men to wish at least for a Reconciliation, and by consequence to make a more favourable Enquiry into the Nature and Excellency of the Establish'd Church; which is all they seem to want for the Conversion of *Dissenters*. The inferior *Dissenters* are not suffer'd now to read those Books that would give them the best Information; they pretend that they have not time, opportunity, nor perhaps inclination so to do. But when they observe that all Preferments run in
that

that Chancel, a *Dissenter* that has many Children, and wishes them all well, and hopes to see them great Men in their respective Professions, will be apt to consider, what are the great Differences between the *Churchmen* and the *Dissenters*, and when they find that they consist only of Ceremonies and lesser Matters, and that there are really no Differences in Essentials; that they may go to Heaven from the Church as well as from the Conventicle, they will be inclin'd to breed up their Children in that Way, in which they may enjoy an Office in this World, and also Happiness in the next; they will be of the Mind of a Wise Man, that being ask'd *which Blessing he would have*, he answer'd, *Both*; and thus the Church will obtain a gradual and safe Advantage over those that dissent from her by gentle and easie Methods, without any force or violence on the Mind of Man, but prevailing by degrees, and working on the Inclination, and hanging out the charming Bait of Self-Interest, together with the power of Reason, Argument, and a good Example, they will every day be catching some, and put Matters in a fair way towards attaining that *General Peace and Union* amongst all Her Majesty's Subjects, which every one cries out for, but no Man proposes a more likely way to obtain.

For my part, I know of no way to obtain *Peace and Union amongst all Her Majesty's Subjects*, but by bringing *the Dissenters to the Church, or the Church to the Dissenters*; and surely none will have the Confidence to suppose, that the latter was ever propos'd or thought of. What! Is the Project mention'd in the *Wolf Stript*, to be set on foot again? Is Episcopacy to be attack'd in *England* as well as in *Scotland*? Are we to fall from Moderate Episcopacy, to no Episcopacy, and at last to no Ordination? Are all the Ceremonies in the Church of *England*, which offend the Nonconformists, to be abolish'd? Is there no part of the Church Communion, which may not be perform'd by a Woman as well as a Man, even the Celebration of the Lord's Supper? Are these your Assertions and Indeavours? And are these the ways to Peace and Union? If not, which way can Union be effected, but by bringing the Dissenters over to the Church? And by what other Method can that be accomplish'd, but by such a Bill; which gives Liberty to all, and only lays a gentle Bias on that side of the *Dissenters* that is next to the Church?

Such a Bill will always keep *Peace*, because both Parties will be out of Danger of one another; and it will immediately promote an Union in Affection, and by degrees in Religion too; but because the Queen's Speech is often made use of in this case, give me leave to suppose what I am afraid is too true, that there are many Men in this Kingdom who are for a Commonwealth, tho' more I hope that are for Monarchy. The Queen recommends *Peace and Union*, Whether must She mean, that the Commonwealths-Men should come over to Monarchy, or that Monarchy should stoop to a Commonwealth? In like manner is it possible to imagine, that by recommending *Peace and Union*, Her Majesty desires that the Church of *England* (in which she was bred, and which she has promis'd to maintain by her Coronation Oath, and by several Speeches from the Throne) should go over to the Sectaries, or the Sectaries come over to the Church? Certainly the meaning is plain, but they will never understand any thing in that Sence, that is disagreeable to their Principles.

As to the Word *Party*, is there no difference between the Sence of that word in common Use, and between the Sence of it, when apply'd to the Government; Did any Government yet endure to be call'd a Party? Or any National Church to be thought a Faction? Those are *Factions and Parties* who differ from the National Church; and therefore when we speak of the Queen at the Head of the Government, Can it be proper to say that she is at the Head of a Party? Or a Faction?

No

No certainly, and yet when speaking of Differences or Disputes, the word may be proper enough, because commonly used in those Cases, and signifies no more than two distinct Persons or Bodies of Men. In one case common Custom warrants the Use of the word without any Reflection on either side; and in the other Case, it is not warranted, but carries with it an Intimation, that is not true nor proper to be said of any Government or establish'd Church.

As to the Challenge made by that Worthy Person *De Foe* to the Church-men, to bring their Loyalty to the Test with the Dissenters, I shall leave that part to a Book call'd the *Wolf Stript*, and to all the Histories of the *English Nation*, where every one that can read may be satisfied: But since he is for this way of proceeding, I make bold to challenge all those State-Dissenters to set down the Articles of their Religion, what it is they do believe and what not, that we may know what to make of them. The Church appears bare-fac'd, and tells the World what their Faith and Doctrine is in the XXXIX. Articles; but I could never learn what Faith or Doctrine these Men will be bound to stick to: For they differ among themselves as much as they do from the Church, and are like so many wild Deer, that will not be kept within the Pale of the Church, but are scattered from the Herd, divided and dispersed over the Face of the whole Country. Every Teacher among them has his own Opinion, and if they agree in any thing, it is in the *Doctrine of Deposing Princes and Episcopal Government*. The Leaders of them will trust but very little to Providence; Self-Denial, Patience, charitable Constructions, Humility, and all the Christian Vertues are laid aside: Nay, they will not so much as trust their own Representatives in Parliament, but every Man sets up to be a Judge in *Israel*. If their Leaders are not to be the Prime Ministers, if they cannot have a Share of the Publick Money, if these Insects cannot grow fat on the Sores and Wounds of the Nation, what then? Then Popery and the pretended Prince of *Wales* are coming in. We must all take Arms to preserve our Religion and Properties, we shall never (say they) be happy whilst we have any of the Family of the *St.—ds* on the Throne? How often has this been said, and yet they would now persuade the World, they are the best Friends to the Government, whilst they are plainly endeavouring to *out-wit the M—y, and Undermine our Constitution*. But is there any such *Doctrine of Deposing Princes* taught by the Church of *England*? No, Sir, this is their Crime that you accuse them of; because they are good Christians, therefore you say, they are for Arbitrary Power; because they won't preach up Rebellion, insult their Superiors, and trample down Monarchy under their Feet; therefore they are accus'd of bringing in Popery and *French Dragoons*, when 'tis evident they have ten times the Reason to oppose both, because they have ten times more value for the true Religion, and ten times as much to lose by any such Alteration: But still you'll say, that the late Revolution was owing to the Members of the Church. Was it so? Then how comes it to pass that you have been so much in Favour, during the last Reign? Was it because you oppos'd King *William*? Or because you betray'd one Prince and obtain'd the Favour of another, by your Flattery and fawning Addresses, by your mean and servile Compliances with those who have got vast Estates to themselves, and left so vast a Debt as Twenty Millions on the Nation? And are you not now playing the same Game over again? Are you not wheedling and fawning, and flattering the Government in order to obtain your Ends? And settle a Presbyterian Antimonarchical Government in this Nation? Does not my Lord *Clarendon's* History set you forth in your proper Colours? Are not you now beginning to act the very same Play that was acted by your Predecessors in the late Times? And what can hinder the dismal Tragedy of another Civil War, but a particular Providence, and a timely Discovery of your dark and wicked Intrigues? Not that I believe the Conscien-

tious Dissenters are engag'd in or acquainted with your deep Designs, but they innocently follow those Leaders, of which you are the Tool, the wretched Instrument that write their Sence and follow the Schemes directed by their College. What miserable Arts and Artifices are made use of to ruine this Nation? How many Clubs are set up for that purpose? How many Collections and Treasurers are appointed to carry on the good old Cause? How many Mercenary Scriblers are hired and paid out of the Publick Stock? How much Money have they given in particular to redeem your sanctify'd Worship out of *Newgate*? What care do they take to buy up and stifle all the Impressions of any Papers that are writ for the Service of the Publick? And to disperse those scandalous Pamphlets wrote by your self and others? What Arts were used to stifle the Representation of the Publick Grievances made by the Commons in the last Session, and at the same time to disperse the Declaration in favour of a Noble L---d, to such a degree, that scarce an Old Woman in *Essex* was without a Present of it; and yet this Noble L---d durst not stand the Test of a fair Trial? What occasion is there for all these Artificial Managements, if there were not some great and dismal Expectations behind the Curtain? What! Do you expect to bring in the *Scotch* for your Assistance? Do you intend to corrupt our Fleets and Armies? Have you any hopes from *Ireland*? Or Countenance from *Holland*? No, that wise Nation will never promote any Design in this Kingdom, which alone can hinder us from giving our utmost Assistance for their Deliverance.

But why do you still engage the Conscientious Dissenters in your Quarrel? What do you propose to do for them? How will you put them in a better Condition than they are already? They want no Places nor Preferments, and if they did, they are too honest to sacrifice the Peace of their Mind for any private Advantage; they want not Liberty of Conscience, they only desire to be secure of that Liberty, and you will not let them; they do not desire to put the Nation in a Flame, or destroy the Established Government by any illegal or violent Proceedings, but would be glad that the Church's Fears were remov'd as well as theirs; that they might live together like Neighbours and Friends; but for your sakes, for such as you, who can write and speak for and against Occasional Conformity at the same time; those harmless Men must be drawn in by Head and Shoulders to engage in a Controversy, which can never make them happier than they are, but may one time or other tend to their Prejudice.

It is not improbable but every Dissenter would be glad, in a fair and Legal way, to repeal the Acts of Uniformity, and establish their own Form of Church Government; but I am perswaded, that there are Thousands of them that abominate your unworthy Practices and Designs, and if occasion were, would openly disown them; and therefore when I speak in general, I mean not the *Conscientious*, but the *State and Politick Dissenters*, that you can accuse and defend in the same Breath: I am not afraid of any Dissenters, but those that you your self condemn for *Ambidexter-Conformity*; and if there be any that call themselves Church-men, and yet have such a Latitude in Principles as agrees with yours, you may put them all in a List together, and dispose of them as you please for the Publick Good. Their *Moderation*, or if you please more properly, their *Indifferency and Lukewarmness in the necessary Defence of their Religion and Government*, is a Character I shall never be ambitious of; being apprehensive that the same Coolness and Moderation, tends to open the Door to Papists as well as to Dissenters: But if by Moderation you mean the granting Indulgence to scrupulous Consciences, it is done, and all the Church-men in *England*, that I know, are entirely for it. We only desire now, that as we have made you safe, you will condescend to make us so too; Why should not the Kindness be reciprocal? I don't believe *De Foe* will lose

an Office by it, but he will not have so much Power to do Mischief then as he has now; for if he keeps an Office, the Conscientious Dissenters will be no longer mislead by him, and will not this be a great Advantage to the Church, to lay open those Politick Dissenters to publick View? Certainly this Bill would have broke the Knot of State-Disserters, that are now so busy in creating Differences and undermining our Constitution both in Church and State.

As to the Merits of your two great Friends in Office, which you maintain in your Treatise, I shall not say much, because I abhor all Personal Reflections; but when they are absolutely necessary to prevent the Designs of evil Men against the Established Government; those that have a mind to be farther satisfied in that matter, may look into the Report of the Commissioners of Accounts and other Proceedings of their respective Offices, and from those Premises, you may draw the Conclusions; but if you will be for making a just Comparison between the Church-men and Dissenters in Office, you ought to do it when each had the Power in their hands, and were Established as the National Church; and then we can assure you that when you were uppermost, *No Church-men were concerned in the Bloody Executions, the Barbarous Prosecutions, or the Illegal Sequestrations of those Times, much less in the Unparalleled and Villainous Murder of their Lawful Sovereign.* We agree that we have ill Men crept in amongst us as well as you, but they never arrived to that pitch of Villany, as not only to teach the Doctrine of Deposing Princes, but also to put it Execution in the most barbarous and inhumane manner; and which is still a greater Aggravation, under the specious Pretence and Colour of Justice; and therefore to repeat no more of your Pious Excellencies and Virtues in those Days, Pray Sir, What have you got by your wise Comparison?

If we have had any ill Men in the Administration during the late Reign, as you are pleas'd to suggest, I assure you, I know of none, but such as you may call by any other Name as well as *Church-men*, they are the very same, Sir, that have always protected such honest Gentlemen as your self; they are the very same whose *Dictates* you still pursue, whose Grandure you desire to see, and on whom your whole Party entirely depend; and by whom, in all Probability, neither the Church or Monarchy will ever receive any great Advantage, and therefore we freely part with them. You may take them amongst you; and I doubt not but they'll answer all your Expectations. There you may have *Blank Patents*, and fill them up for your selves; there you may have *Partners in Illegal Grants*, good Places and Offices for your Money, *Liberty on reasonable Terms* to defraud the Publick; easy Compositions for Debts to the Treasury, *High Premiums*, Extravagant Interest, and Excessive Rates for Stores and Provisions. Who would not desire such Men as these to sit at Helm? And Occasionally conform to get them into the Government? And whenever they come there, I dare assure you that no other but Men of your Kidney and Principles, shall ever get any real Advantage by them.

And now, Sir, I hope you will not be offended that as you treat Sir H. so I take the Confidence to treat you also in your Scribling Capacity. I don't presume to treat you as the Author of that Noble Design of setting the Church-men and Dissenters together by the Ears, of involving the Nation in a Civil War, and in Ruine and Destruction, nor as you are a Man of Honour, advanced to that high Degree and Post of the P—ry, but as you are one of the famous Penmen of an Unanimous Club, and by them encouraged amongst others to publish such Pamphlets as contradict your self, and tend to the Ruine of the Establish'd Government: But give me leave to tell your Friends, for I write rather for their sake than yours, that if they don't leave off in time, they'll find themselves miserably deluded in the Strength of their Party;

Party; for besides that, in all the Counties of *England*, there may be Twenty Churchmen for one Dissenter. There are many Dissenters in *England*, who will never submit to your new Scheme of Church Government. They remember very well what sort of Indulgence was formerly granted to them during that sort of Administration: And as they are not concerned in Occasional Conformity, so they will not engage in any Differences with the Church on that occasion.

But to return to your chief Objection against this Bill, which seems to you unanswerable, and with which a great many honest well-meaning Men have been strangely misguided: You object that this Bill provides against Occasional Conformity of Dissenters, but not of Atheists, Deists, and the like; So that it is not the Men of no Religion, but the Men of too much Religion we are afraid of. No, good Sir, you are mightily mistaken, we neither like those that have no Religion, nor think any of you have too much; and when we treat of Religious Matters, we agree the Atheists and Deists are the worst of Men: But when we treat of a *Qualification-Bill* for Publick Officers, we do not consider the *Crime* (as Sir H. M. tells you) but the *Publick Safety*. Now, God be prais'd, if any such profligate Wretches are in the World, they are not grown so numerous as to be formidable without your Assistance, or to appear together in Opposition to the Government; and where there is no appearing Danger, there is not so much Necessity for a Law. They may be Friends to the Constitution, tho' not to themselves: This is one Consideration, but this is the least; you may find out a Test to bind a Man of some Religion or other, but what Test will be sufficient to restrain a Person of no Religion at all? If you appoint a Test of three or more Sacraments instead of one, they will certainly take them all, and what do you do then, but prostitute that Holy Ordinance, and cast Pearls before Swine? Why did not some of these Objectors propose a rational Method in this case? Why did not the L—ds make an Amendment to the Bill for that purpose, and try the House of Commons? But only because they thought it impracticable: If then such a Test is not yet found practicable, to what end was that Objection rais'd, but to throw out the Bill, and cast a Blemish on the H—se of C—ns, because they did not do an impracticable thing?

There is yet a farther Consideration in this case; For if the C—ns found great difficulty to pass a Bill for curing one *Evil*, how could they expect to have found it easie in this degenerate Age, to pass a Remedy for a multitude of them, especially when it appears so difficult to Pen a Law that may be effectual for that purpose; that may be able to punish the Bad, and not be a Snare to the Innocent and Good? But at this rate the C—ns must never attempt to pass one good Law, unless they can pass twenty at the same time. When the Bill was propos'd against *Prophane Swearing and Cursing*, why might it not have been as reasonably objected against that Bill, that *Lying* is as great a Sin as *Swearing*? And therefore if they did not inflict a punishment on *Lying* in the same Bill, they did plainly Countenance that Sin. But if these sort of Objections should prevail, the Parliament would never be able to pass any good Law whatsoever, for some or other would still clog the Bill with another Offence. However, I heartily wish that some Way may be found out in due time, to keep such Men out of the Administration of Publick Affairs, which may neither subject good Men to very great Difficulties, nor yet suffer the bad to prosper in their Wickedness; but now this Bill is over, some body else must take care of that Matter, for I expect to hear no more of it, from these *Occasional Writers*.

But still they say it cannot be unsafe to trust an honest Man, whatever his Opinion may be in Matters of Religion: I confess I have a great respect for an honest Man, for it is very hard to find one; but tho' he be ever so honest in his private Dealings,

Dealings, yet if he be no friend to the Constitution, I can't see how it is prudent to trust him with that. I'll trust him to make me a Sute of Clothes, or to furnish me with good Cloth for that purpose; nay, I'll trust my ready Cash in his hands, but what then? It is his Interest and his Principles to be faithful to me in that case, but it is directly against his Interest and Principles to preserve that which he conceives to be an Erroneous Church; he cannot be an honest Man in his Way, unless he would take all opportunities in a legal and peaceable manner, which every Publick Officer and Member of Parliament may do, either to Repeal, or at least to avoid the Execution of those Laws, which he in his Conscience thinks to be Erroneous. Therefore, Sir, you see that Sir H. may very well be of Opinion, that many *Dissenters* are honest Men, and yet that it is not safe to entrust them with the Publick Administration and Execution of those Laws that are inconsistent with their Principles, 'For it is impossible but they must be uneasy and dissatisfy'd, tho' never so good Men, and we must look upon them, whilst in Publick Offices, as waiting for a fit opportunity of easing themselves, and of modelling things more and more their own way; and therefore if a *Dissenter* be also a Wise and Politick Man, there may still be more reason to keep him out of the Administration, lest those Abilities should make him more successful in his Endeavours to Introduce a change into our Establishment.

But it is also objected, That the Imposing a *Sacramental Test* is Unchristian and Unreasonable in its Nature: How so? Is it not fit that those Men that are entrusted with the Publick Safety should be good Men, and good Christians? 'And is not receiving the Sacrament the Duty of every good Man? Does it not prepare and fit them for the more Conscientious Discharge of their Trusts? And why then are any to be blam'd for requiring such Assurance, by an action which is not only a Duty, but also apt to induce the most Sacred Obligation of Fidelity to the Publick? An Oath is a very Solemn Act of Religion, and yet we wisely serve even our Temporal Interests by it in Judicial Cases; however, this Bill only forbids a Publick Officer to go to a *Conventicle*, and therefore was not concern'd in that Objection.

But after all, is it not a Matter of some astonishment, that even Mr. *De Foe* should expose himself and his Party by such Inconsistent Arguments, and by such indecent Language, to a Gentleman that treated the *Dissenters* with so much Candour? As to what he says of the six Articles in the Reign of H. VIII. they are as much to the purpose as the next Story in that History, let it be what it will; unless he could make out, that *not allowing to hold an Office*, is just the same thing as *High Treason, and a fiery Furnace*. Did the King only make the six Articles as a Test for Publick Officers? And was a Man to lose nothing by not taking them but an Office? I dare say, if that had been the case, not one *Protestant* in those days would have been much concern'd for any hardship upon himself, tho' he might be troubled for the Errors of the Articles. But really, I am a weary of answering Arguments so little to the purpose. I shall therefore conclude with him by annexing an Abstract of his own words, in his Treatise against his Teacher Mr. *How*, and leave it to the Reader, whether he ought not to be painted with two Faces in the Frontispiece of this Book.

As to Mr. *Lacy* and Dr. *B.* who have set their Names to their Pamphlets, I leave them to Sir H. if he thinks them worthy of any Answer I desire to treat all such Persons according to their Merits. Dr. *B.* I know not, I believe Mr. *Lacy* is a Man of Candour and Principles, and whatever mistakes has happen'd in his Quotations out of Sir H's Book, I presume they were not voluntary, but for want of time or due attention. If therefore this hasty Treatise, abstracted from the

little uneasiness which *De Foe* has occasion'd, do not contain a Satisfactory Answer, I must desire they will lay aside prejudice, and once more read over Sir *H's* Treatise, which, well consider'd, does in my Opinion, carry with it a very full Vindication and Answer to all its Opposers.

But I beg pardon, I had almost forgot to explain a mighty Myfterious Assertion in the Dedication of Sir *H's* Book; *Your Majesty (says he) and the Three Estates of the Realm, Who are all Members of the National Church, do constitute the Body Politick of this Kingdom; and you are neither one of the Three Estates, nor do constitute a Fourth, but you are the Sovereign Head of that great Body.* This expression gives great Offence to the Worshipful Observer, and to the Learned Dr. B. but I wonder at the latter, because there are few Doctors of the Civil Law in England but read *Coke's Institutes*, especially his Fourth Part, concerning the Jurisdiction of Courts; and there he might have found, as well as in many other Records, and ancient Authorities, that the *Lords Spiritual* did constitute one of the *Three Estates*, the *Lords Temporal* another, and the *Representatives of the People* the third; then it is plain the *Queen* cannot be one of the *Three Estates*, there is no room for Her Majesty, there are *Three Estates* without the *Queen*; therefore she must either constitute a *Fourth Estate*, or be the *Sovereign Head* of that great Body. But no Man ever read of a *Fourth Estate*, unless it were in the *Observer*, neither are there any more than *Three*. It must therefore be very obvious, that as the *Queen* is the *Common Parent* of her People, so she is the *Sovereign Head* of that *Body Politick*. But say the Critical Objectors, there are but *Three Estates*, ergo, if the *Queen* be not one of the *Three*, she must constitute a *Fourth*; that is to say, just as it is in the *Body Natural*: There are but two Legs, but the *Head* is not one of the two Legs; ergo, it constitutes a third Leg. This is your *Grubstreet* Logick that puzzles the Doctor.

It is true, the *Lords Spiritual and Temporal* have been long united, and do sit together in one House, and therefore when Sir *H.* treated of the Constitution upon another Occasion, and as now Establish'd, he takes notice only of *King, Lords and Commons*; but it is plain, he did not intend thereby to destroy the Sovereignty of the Crown, and make the *King* to have a Co-ordinate Power with the *Lords and Commons*, but he distinguish'd between the *Legislative* and *Executive Authority*. The *Legislative* is in *King, Lords and Commons*, but the *Executive Authority* is solely in the *King*, and therefore he alledges the *King*, as the *Head*, has the Power of *making War and Peace, of Calling and Dissolving Parliaments, of Commanding the Militia and Forces of the Kingdom; of appointing all Officers, Ecclesiastical, Civil and Military. And, in short, enjoys all other Powers and Prerogatives that a Wise and Good Prince can desire, to make him Happy and Beloved at Home, as well as Potent and Respected Abroad.*

There was a time when the *Three Estates* acted in some respects as distinct Bodies, and the *Clergy* Tax'd themselves; but tho' two of the *Three Estates* now act together as one, it does not therefore follow, that the *King* is divested of his Sovereignty as *Head* of that *Body*. And therefore my Lord *Coke* tells you, 4th. Inst. p. 3. That of the High Court of Parliament the *King* is *Caput, Principium & Finis*, and when the *King, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and the Knights, Citizens and Burgeses*, (which he just before calls the *Three Estates*) are all by the *King's* Command assembled and joined together, under the *Head*, in Consultation for the *Common Good of the whole Realm*, there (says he) is *ultimum Sapientiae*; that is, from this High Court there lies no Appeal.

But

But when some Men are using all the indirect Arts imaginable to undermine our Monarchy in the State, and Episcopal Government in the Church; What will Reason or Argument signifie to such Persons? Tho' they are baff'd and confuted a Hundred times, yet they'll still write on, as if no Answer had been given to them. What occasion is there at this time of day to write so much against the Sovereignty of the Crown, against Passive Obedience, and for the Doctrine of deposing Princes, if Men did not think that in a little time there would be occasion for them to rebel? Are they not now sounding the Trumpet, and preparing their Party for it, and yet they are Bantering, and Wheedling, and Flattering the M—rs, as if they were the only Men that were either able or willing to stand by them, and support the Government? But there is no doubt, tho' the Bill is thrown out, the M—rs will still remember that these Men are *Occasional Conformists*; and that they can be *Convinc'd, and Reconvinc'd, and then Convinc'd again*. They will be as constant as my Lord Shaftsbury's *Weathercock*, which was always true to the Wind, whether it blow'd *North, South, East, or West*; and they'll use their Patrons, as their Children do their Paper Kites; they'll blow them up to the end of the String, and then let go their hold, taking as much Pleasure to see how they fall, as they did to see them mount.

Et qui vult Decipi, Decipiatur.

But if they are rewarded according to their Merits, they will be used at last as some pretended Christians were by the Pagan Emperor *Constantius Chlorus*, who telling the Christian Nonconformists at Court, that unless they would sacrifice to his Gods, they should lose their Places; some of them did, and some did not, and thereupon he continued those that did not, and discarded the *Occasional Conformists, as Men that would never be true to him, who were false to their God*. For tho' their Crime be not so great, yet it is something of the same Nature, if you will believe *De Foe's Treatise against How*, in Answer to *De Foe's Treatise against Mackworth*; to which the Author doth refer himself, and of which the following Sentences formerly extracted, are here again Reprinted for the Satisfaction of the Reader.

De Foe's OPINION concerning the BILL for Preventing Occasional Conformity.

WHAT is the publick Possession of Places, or Offices of Trust in a Government, to the Case of Religion? They who separate from the Communion of a Church, cannot in reason expect to be entertained in the Service of that very Church: And they that separate from the Church, ought to consider Places and Offices beforehand, and to examine whether they can forego them for their Consciences or not, and if they did so, they would not be so frequently foregoing their Consciences to possess them again.

And I cannot but wonder at, and condemn the Injustice of such Dissenters, who would have those People, to whose Communion they cannot or will not join, receive them into equal Advantages of Honour and Profit, of Trust and Management, in the Politick Concern.

I cannot approve the equity of it, nor I would not have the Dissenters cover it; nor had they the Government in their hands, would they admit it themselves.

This coveting Offices of Trust, Honour and Profit, in the Government, has been the cause of that Occasional Compliance, which to the Dishonour and Shame of the Dissenters, has Branded them with too much Levity in Religion.

For whoever dissents from an Establish'd Church on any account, but from a real Principle of Conscience, is a Politick, not a Religious Dissenter.

Nothing can be Lawful and Unlawful at the same time. If it be not Lawful for me to Dissent, I ought to Conform, but if it be Unlawful for me to Conform I must Dissent; and he that cannot Die, or at least desire to do so, rather than Conform, ought to Conform.

If I shall Dissent, and yet at the same time Conform, by Conforming I deny my Dissent being Lawful; or by my Dissenting, I damn my Conforming as sinful.

An Act of Parliament is of every Mans own doing, and therefore 'tis just every Man should comply with the Terms or suffer the Penalty; but here is no Penalty, if no Crime, and if no Preferments are sought, no Honours accepted, there is no Crime; if Self-denial was as practicable as Self advancement, here is no need of Occasional Conformity, for all such do seek the Crime, that is the first Sin, then Mortgage their Consciences to avoid the Penalty, and so add one Sin to another.

No Man can be said to separate from, and join to a thing at the same time, if your Conscience is satisfy'd in joining; it cannot be satisfy'd in separating, unless you can suppose your Conscience to be satisfy'd and dissatisfy'd both together.

A Man passively Religious, that can Communicate any where, may from the same Principle, and with far less guilt, Communicate no where, for he has prostituted the little Religion he had, if ever he had any, to his Interest.

No Occasional Conformist can be receiv'd into Communion in any Dissenting Assembly, upon any other Terms than as a Penitent; for this Practice is preposterous, excentrick and destructive of the very Foundation of the Dissenters Principles.

Methinks Men should seem what they are, if a Man dissent from the Church let him do so, and his Principle being well grounded for such Dissent, let him hold it; if not well-grounded, let him leave it, if he cannot suffer one way, let him suffer another, and why should we not be as honest to God as our Country?

'Tis an intolerable Affront to the Church of England, reflecting upon its Doctrine as well as Practice, to make use of the Church for a Cover to fence them against the Laws, at the same time continuing to Disown its Communion as a thing not fit to be continued in.

Conformity and Nonconformity at the same time, in one and the same Person, for a Secular End, to save a penalty, and privately; and then, as being ashamed of it, to go back and sit down as not having done it at all, are Contradictions I must insist upon, and rather wish, than expect to see rectify'd.

He who dissents from the Establish'd Church, except from true Principles of Conscience, is guilty of a great Sin.

He who Conforms to the Establish'd Church against his Conscience, is guilty of a great Sin.

He who both Dissents and Conforms at the same time, and in the same point of Religion, must be guilty of one of these great Sins.

And he who has committed either of these Sins, ought not to be receiv'd again on either side, on any other Terms than a Penitent.

As to Partial Conformity, Dissent in some things, and Conforming in others, does not seem to concern this Case, no Man among the Dissenters pretended to dissent in every thing, but we are speaking of conforming in those very Points in which we dissent, and that no less than the Article of Communion.

If Gentlemen who have such a Latitude in their Opinions, wou'd not have it thought they are moved to it by their Interests, let them practise it openly, and not Time it so, to the very Eve of an Election, as to have it speak of it self, and, as it were, force Men to believe it done on purpose; nay, let them not put such a Reproach in the Mouths of their Enemies, as to have it spoken in contempt, with circumstances that stop the Mouths of Argument, and are as Convincing as Demonstration.

'Tis not a light thing to shift and change Communion with an Establish'd, and with a Separate Church, as often as convenience, or Reason of State or Interest invite.

As to the Excuse that is made, That this is no Conformity in Point of Religion, but done as a Civil Action, in Obedience to the Laws of the Land, as a Qualification for admittance into Publick Employments, which they think it their Duty to accept, in order to Serve their Country; are not Sacraments Religious Acts? Are they not the same thing, tho' differently Administred in the Establish'd, and in the Dissenting Church? And how can you take it as a Civil Action in one place, and a Religious Act in another? This is playing Bo peep with God Almighty, and no Man can tell when they are about a Civil Action, and when about a Religious. And if the Service of their Country be so dear to them, pray why should they not undergo the Penalties, and chuse to expose their Bodies and Estates for that Service, rather than their Souls? These are Patriots indeed! that will damn their Souls to save their Country!

Country! For, as hath been observ'd, Conformity is a Sinful Act in a Dissenter, or else his dissenting before and after must be a Sinful Act; and he has no Excuse, unless it be that he was convinc'd and re-convinc'd, and then convinc'd again.

After description of true Protestant Dissenters, who cannot conform, he proceeds in this manner: If there are crept into their Company State-Dissenters, or Politick Dissenters, they are not of them, and we wish they would go out from them. I see no Act of Parliament a making to the prejudice of this Dissenter.—This is the Dissenter to which Her Majesty has promis'd her Protection. The Act against Occasional Conformity does not concern us, I dare undertake not one Dissenter offer'd to present a Petition to the Honourable House against its passing; they who can conform for one Reason, may conform without two, and ought to conform. And we are therefore content to be distinguish'd who cannot conform at all; if we have any Knaves amongst us, take them; if we have any Hypocrites, any who can conform and do not, we are free to part with them, that the remainder may be all such as agree with the true Character of a Conscientious Dissenter.

'Tis plain, that Occasional Communion is contrary to the very Nature and Being of a Dissenter, who, if he can conform, ought to conform; and if he can for a Place of Preferment, ought to do it without the Preferment.

It is an Act destructive of all possible pretence for dissenting, and never was, nor never can be defended by any Dissenter, without overthrowing all the Reasons they could ever give for dissenting; How then can this Bill be aim'd at the Dissenters? We hold it to be a Novelty, an Abuse crept in amongst us, and we are glad to have it condemn'd by Authority. We are so content with the suppressing the grievance of this scandalous Ambidexter Conformity, that we think the Hardships put upon us with it not worth the naming.

All the Parliaments that ever were, or will be, can never suppress any thing amongst us so scandalous to our Reputation, and to that Candour with which we desire to guide our Actions, nor so contrary to, and destructive of the very Nature of our separating from the Church of England, and the Constitution of all our Collected Congregations; and therefore, if these Occasional Conformists would accept of the Friendly Advice of their Brethren, it should be, That they would for the future conform to the Church of England.

As for his Authority to write thus in the Name of the Dissenters, he alledges that he hath the General Concurrence of all the Dissenters he ever convers'd with, that Publication is an Appeal to the World, and if he hath affirm'd any thing in the Name of the Dissenters which is not their Opinion, he is liable to an easie Confutation: Truth (says he) is a General Commission, and any Man may write it.

F I N I S.

